



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—POMPEIUS TROGUS AND JUSTINUS.

I. TROGUS.

The Epitome of the work of Pompeius Trogus, by Justinus, does not reveal much that is definite in regard to the work of either writer. However, there are two statements of Justinus indicating in a general way the chronology of Trogus. At the end of Book 43 is found the following: In postremo libro Trogus ait maiores suos originem a Vocontiis ducere; avum suum Trogum Pompeium Sertoriano bello civitatem a Cn. Pompeio percepisse, patrum Mithridatico bello turmas equitum sub eodem Pompeio duxisse; patrem quoque sub C. Caesare militasse epistularumque ac legationum et anuli curam habuisse. From this we may infer that the birth of Trogus was not far from the middle of the first century B. C., and that he was of the same generation as Livy. The other passage is in 38, 3, 11 quam orationem dignam duxi, cuius exemplum brevitati huius operis insererem; quam obliquam Pompeius Trogus exposuit, quoniam in Livio et in Sallustio reprehendit, quod contiones directas pro sua oratione operi suo inserendo historiae modum excesserint. We can not tell whether this remark was in connection with the oration given, or was prefatory to the entire work. All that we can definitely know is that some parts of the work of Trogus were written after some parts of the work of Livy.

The parallel passages collected by Crohn, *De Trogi Pompei apud antiquos auctoritate*, point to Trogus as one of the sources of Valerius Maximus. This can be illustrated by Val. Max. 9, 10, Ext. 1 and Just. 1, 8, 9. The same fact is stated by Herodotus 1, 214, yet the variations in the form of statement indicate that Val. Max. drew from a preceding Latin writer. Vell. Paterc. 1, 8, 3 and Just. 2, 7, 1 are also very much alike; and these and other passages show the utilization of Trogus by both writers, and fix some time in the reign of Tiberius as the date before which the work of Trogus must have been published. Noticeable is the statement in 39, 1, 3 sed dum aliena adfectat,

ut adsolet fieri, propria . . . amisit, for it changes the order of the parts, one of the verbs, and, from singular to plural, the two adjectives of Phaedrus 1, 4, 1,

Amittit merito proprium qui alienum appetit.

Considering the nature of the work of Justinus, the variation he has used seems to have been derived by Trogus from Phaedrus, and if it was, the statement of the Monk Matthew in his *Flores Historiarum* can not be true, for he says, anno divinae incarnationis nono, Caesare Augusto imperii sui Lium agente annum Trogus Pompeius Chronica sua terminavit; see Schanz, *Geschichte der Röm. Litt.*, sec. 328.

As Trogus criticised both Sallust and Livy, it is probable that he made free use of both. The long list of parallel examples collected by Sellge, *De Studiis in Sallustio Crispo a Pompeio Trogo et Justino epitomatore collocatis*, shows that Trogus gathered with a free hand from Sallust. It is safe to assume that he made use of Livy in the same way, with the possible difference that he may have used the parts of the work of Livy as they appeared.

Some rhetorical features of the work of Justinus find parallels in the work of Livy. This does not necessarily show that one borrowed from the other, but that both may have been subject to the same influences, and may have been affected in the same way. To illustrate this, some passages will be quoted from Justinus having similar elements in Livy; see the *Historical Attitude of Livy*, A. J. P. XXV, 15 foll. Just. 3, 7, 16 bellum . . . quod priusquam expono, de Siciliae situ pauca dicenda sunt; 11, 15, 1 interea Dareus . . . vincitur, credo ita diis immortalibus iudicantibus, ut . . . finiretur. The plural *accepi-mus* occurs in 7, 1, 5; and 20, 1, 15 quid Tarentini, quos a Lacedaemone profectos spuriosque vocatos a.? Compare in 42, 2, 7 sed quoniam in Armeniam transitum facimus, origo eius paulo altius repetenda est. Similar to these are *memoravimus* in 20, 5, 1; and *videmus* in 20, 1, 8. The potential subjunctive is found in 6, 2, 7 postquam Agesilaum . . . misere, non facile dixerim, quod aliud par ducum tam bene comparatum fuerit. Livy's method is also followed in referring to other parts of the work: 2, 5, 9; 23, 3, 2 sicut supra dictum est; 10, 2, 1 cuius

mentio supra habita est. We find in 4, 1, 1; and 20, 1, 16 ferunt; in 42, 3, 7; and 44, 3, 1 multi auctores prodidere. There are also some generalizing statements: 5, 1, 11 ut fit; 2, 13, 2 et in maius, sicuti mos est, omnia extollens; 39, 1, 3 ut adsolet fieri. Here also may be placed a few maxims: 6, 1, 1 Lacedaemonii, more ingenii humani quo plura habent eo ampliora cupientes; 20, 5, 3 tantum virtutis paupertas adversus insolentes divitias habet, tantoque insperata interdum sperata victoria certior est; 6, 8, 2 sicuti telo si primam aciem praefergeris, reliquo ferro vim nocendi sustuleris. There are a few other occurrences of the indefinite second person: 4, 1, 18 ea est enim procul insipientibus natura loci, ut sinum maris, non transitum putes, quo cum accesseris, discedere ac seiungi promuntoria . . . arbitrare. Other instances are in the imperfect: 2, 12, 24 cerneres; 14, 6, 11 posses; 2, 9, 12; and 13, 1, 10 putares; and the best illustrative passage 11, 6, 5 ut non tam milites quam magistros militiae lectos putares. Ordines quoque nemo nisi sexagenarius duxit, ut, si principia castrorum cerneres, senatum te priscae alicuius rei publicae videre diceres.

Here and there are found indefinite statements not unlike some of Livy's: 4, 1, 16 quantum nunc admirationis, tantum antiquis terroris dederit; 15, 2, 9 tanto honestius tunc bella gerebantur quam nunc amicitiae coluntur; 41, 1, 1 Parthi, penes quos velut divisione orbis cum Romanis facta nunc Orientis imperium est, Scytharum exules fuere; 36, 3, 9 facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus. These are interesting contrasts, but they give nothing definite in regard to the time of writing; and the same is true of statements in Trogus which were influenced by what Livy had already written.

A number of short passages in the first book of Livy are similar to ones found in the forty-third book of Justinus: L. 1, 1, 11 oppidum condunt; Aeneas ab nomine uxoris Lavinium appellat: J. 43, 1, 12 urbem ex nomine uxoris Lavinium condidit; L. 1, 5, 4 sic Numitori ad supplicium Remus deditur: J. 43, 2, 9 tunc a rege Numitori in ultionem traditur; L. 1, 4, 3 sacerdos vincta in custodiam datur; pueros in profluentem aquam mitti iubet: J. 43, 2, 4 pueros exponi iubet et puellam vinculis onerat. The reversal of the order of the parts in the last statement is noticeable, as also in some others which may have been derived from a common source: L. 37, 45, 12 animos

. . . eosdem in omni fortuna gessimus gerimusque, neque eos secundae res extulerunt nec adversae minuerunt: J. 31, 8, 8 Africano praedicante, Romanos neque, si vincantur, animos minuire neque, si vincant, secundis rebus inolescere. Illustrations of other statements which may have a common source are as follows: L. 37, 1, 10 experiri libebat, utrum plus regi Antiocho in Hannibale victo an in victore Africano consuli legionibusque Romanis auxilii foret: J. 31, 7, 2 ut intellegeret Antiochus non maiorem fiduciam se in Hannibale victo quam Romanos in victore Scipione habere; L. 37, 37, 3 Iliensibus in omni rerum verborumque honore ab se oriundos Romanos praeferentibus et Romanis laetis origine sua: J. 31, 8, 1 Iliensibus Aenean ceterosque cum eo duces a se profectos, Romanis se ab his procreatos referentibus. In the last pair quoted we have *praeferentibus: referentibus*, in the first Africano: Scipione, and in L. 39, 50, 10 P. Scipionem: J. 32, 4, 9 Scipionis Africani. If these are independent statements it is strange that the writers did not hit on the same form of statement in one at least of the three variations cited.

The changes made by Philip of Macedon are described in J. 8, 5, 9 non quidem pavor ille hostilis nec discursus per urbem militum erat, non tumultus armorum, non bonorum atque hominum rapina, sed tacitus maeror et luctus, verentibus, ne ipsae lacrimae pro contumacia haberentur . . . nunc sepulcra maiorum, nunc veteres penates, nunc tecta, in quibus geniti erant quibusque genuerant, considerabant. This adapts Livy 1, 29, 2 non quidem fuit tumultus ille nec pavor . . . clamor hostilis et cursus per urbem armatorum . . . sed silentium triste ac tacita maestitia . . . cum larem ac penates tectaque, in quibus natus quisque educatusque esset, relinquentes exirent. At one point the setting in Justinus is simpler, for he has *tacitus maeror ac luctus* for Livy's *silentium triste ac tacita maestitia*—silence sad and silent sadness. On the other hand the statement of Livy is expanded by Trogus with *nunc . . . nunc . . . nunc*, and instead of *in quibus natus quisque educatusque*, there is given a new contrast *geniti erant . . . genuerant*. There is also a noticeable resemblance in many shorter passages, and of these some will be given from each of the decades of Justinus. J. 2, 7, 4 qui velut novam civitatem legibus conderet: L. 1, 19, 1 urbem novam, conditam vi et armis, iure eam legibusque ac

moribus de integro condere parat; J. 5, 1, 5 and 43, 5, 4 velut ad commune extinguendum incendium concurrunt: L. 28, 42, 10 velut ad commune restinguendum incendium concurrent; J. 6, 8, 6 ut sumptus funeri defuerit: L. 2, 33, 11 sumptus funeri defuit; J. 13, 1, 4 omnes barbarae gentes . . . ut parentem luxerunt: L. 2, 7, 4 matronae annum ut parentem eum luxerunt; J. 13, 6, 2 quippe hostes . . . recepti occisis coniugibus et liberis domos quisque suas . . . incenderunt eoque congestis etiam servitiis semet ipsi praecipitant: L. 21, 14, 1 in ignem . . . plerique semet ipsi praecipitaverunt; and in sec. 4 inclusi cum coniugibus ac liberis domos super se ipsos concremaverunt; J. 12, 15, 1 agnoscere se fatum domus *suae* ait: L. 27, 51, 12 agnoscere se fortunam Carthagini fertur dixisse; J. 22, 8, 6 paululum modo adniterentur: L. 35, 5, 11 obtestabatur, ut paulum adniterentur; J. 24, 5, 12 non votis agendum: L. 22, 5, 2 nec inde votis . . . evadendum; J. 32, 4, 9 insignis hic annus trium toto orbe maximorum imperatorum mortibus fuit, Hannibalis et Philopoemenis et Scipionis Africani; cf. 5, 8, 7 insignis hic annus et expugnatione Athenarum et morte Darei, regis Persarum, et exilio Dionysii, Siciliae tyranni, fuit: L. 39, 50, 10 velut ad insignem notam huius anni, memoriae mandatum sit tres claros imperatores eo anno decessisse, Philopoemenem, Hannibalem, P. Scipionem; J. 42, 1, 3 pueritiae sibi flore conciliatum: L. 21, 2, 3 flore aetatis . . . conciliatus; J. 44, 2, 2 si extraneus deest, domi hostem quaerunt: L. 30, 44, 8 si foris hostem non habet, domi invenit. The scene described by Livy in 1, 40, 7 dum intentus in eum se rex totus averteret, alter elatam securim in caput deiecit, is reproduced in J. 16, 5, 15 dum alterum dicentem intentus audit tyrannus, ab altero obtruncatur, with the grammatical correction of Livy's imperfect subjunctive with *dum*. Owing to the loss of the larger part of Livy's work it can not be absolutely determined whether Trogus made any use of the work of Livy after book forty-five.

Though there are resemblances in the language used indicating that Trogus adapted the words of Livy to his own uses, the historical spheres of the two writers are quite distinct. The interpretation of this is that Trogus avoided what had already been given by Livy. Trogus in book 43 has a section referring to the days of Romulus up to the seizure of the Sabine women. Then it is stated in 43, 3, 2 finitimis populis armis subactis, primo

Italiae, mox orbis imperium quaesitum. There follows (sec. 3) a little piece of antiquarian lore, *per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademate habebant*, and continuing, the narrative takes up the founding of Massilia and the affairs of the Ligurians in the days of the Tarquins. Book 44 deals with Spain, and tells of Geryon and Habis, and of Viriatus in 44, 2, 7 in tanta saeculorum serie nullus illis dux magnus praeter Viriatum fuit, qui annis decem Romanos varia victoria fatigavit. Florus has in 2, 17, 15 per quattuordecim annos, restating the facts from Livy; see Per. 52 and 54. Although the grandfather of Trogus was in the Sertorian war (J. 43, 5, 11), neither Justinus nor the Prologi make mention of Sertorius. In contrast with this, Florus gives an entire chapter (3, 22) to the war, and Livy (see Per. 90 foll.) described it in such detail that Trogus did not write anything about it.

II. JUSTINUS.

Justinus has a few references which we may assume were true for his own time as well as for that of Trogus. We find in 20, 1, 6 multae urbes . . . vestigia Graeci moris ostentant, and again in sec. 16 Thurinorum urbem condidisse Philocteten ferunt; ibique adhuc monumentum eius visitur, et Herculis sagittae in Apollinis templo, quae fatum Troiae fuere. Metapontini quoque in templo Minervae ferramenta, quibus Epeos, a quo conditi sunt, equum Troianum fabricavit, ostentant. The first of these is evidently complimentary to Augustus (see Suet. Aug. 7). 33, 2, 7 Macedonia . . . libera facta est legesque, quibus adhuc utitur, a Paulo accepit; 41, 5, 6 cuius memoriae hunc honorem Parthi tribuerunt, ut omnes exinde reges suos Arsacis nomine nuncupent. Similar to this are 41, 6, 8; and 41, 1, 1 where are mentioned the extension by Mithridates of the Parthian power to the Euphrates, and the division of the world between the Parthians and the Romans. These last passages, taken in connection with the description of Armenia in 42, 2, 7 foll., show that Justinus wrote before 226 A. D. when the Parthian power was overthrown, and Armenia became a part of the new kingdom. That Justinus would not have left unchanged a statement of such wide political significance, if it were not applicable to his own times, is indicated by 41. 5. 8

Tertius Parthis rex Priapatius fuit, sed et ipse Arsaces dictus. Nam sicut supra dictum est, omnes reges suos hoc nomine, sicuti Romani Caesares Augustosque, cognominavere. We may then safely place the date of Justinus between 226 A. D. and the time at which the Romans began to use *Caesares* and *Augusti* as official titles for the emperors.

The line of the Caesars as is shown by the work of Suetonius was continuous to the reign of Nero, with whom, Suet. Galba 1 progenies Caesarum . . . defecit. Galba, Otho and Vitellius have the title *Imperator*, while Vespasian and his sons are undesigned. But it is said of Otho, Vita 7 ab infima plebe appellatus Nero . . . primisque epistulis . . . Neronis cognomen adiecit; compare Titus 7 denique propalam alium Neronem et opinabantur et praedicabant. The movement toward the title is shown in Nero 46 conclamatum est ab universis: Tu facies, Auguste! and by Vitellius 8 cognomen . . . Augusti distulit, Caesaris in perpetuum recusavit, Vitellius following the example of Tiberius, Suet. Tib. 26 ac ne Augusti quidem nomen, quamquam hereditarium, ullis nisi ad reges ac dynastas epistulis addidit. The words of Ovid, Fasti 1, 531

et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit

are merely a wish, while those of Seneca, de Clem. 1, 14, 2 Magnos et Felices et Augustos diximus are complimentary plurals, indicating merely personal attitude. The official recognition of the words as titles came later.

Aelius Spartianus tells us in his life of Helius, Hist. Aug. 2, 2, 1 nihil habet in sua vita memorabile, nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus, non testamento, ut antea solebat, neque eo modo quo Traianus est adoptatus, sed eo prope genere, quo nostris temporibus a vestra clementia Maximianus atque Constantius Caesares dicti sunt quasi quidam principum filii virtute designati augustae maiestatis heredes. A similar account is found in 2, 2, 6. In 2, 5, 12-14 he gives the official establishment of the title Augustus: Eius est filius Antoninus Verus, qui adoptatus est a Marco, vel certe cum Marco et cum eodem aequale gessit imperium. Nam ipsi sunt qui primi duo Augusti appellati sunt, et quorum fastis consularibus sic nomina praescribuntur, ut dicantur non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti.

Tantumque huius rei et novitas et dignitas valuit, ut fasti consulares nonnulli ab his sumerent ordinem consulum. He also states in 2, 7, 5 his intention of giving the history of all qui vel Caesares vel Augusti vel principes appellati sunt, quique in adoptionem venerunt, vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt.

Interpreting the words of Justinus by the facts here stated, he is to be placed between the reign of Hadrian and 226 A. D. If there can be any closer determination of the date, it must be on the basis of the language used.

The words in the Preface 4 Horum igitur quattuor et quadraginta voluminum (nam tot idem edidit) per otium, quo in urbe versabamur, cognitione quaeque dignissima excerpsi et omissis his, quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo erant necessaria, breve veluti florum corpusculum feci, ut haberent et qui Graece didicissent, quo admonerentur, et qui non didicissent, quo instruerentur. These words state the method of Justinus, his object, and let us know that his home was not at Rome.

1. The Prologi of the work of Trogus show that many of the topics presented in the original work are not mentioned at all by Justinus. This is well shown by book 19, one-half of which is taken up with an account of the return of Himilco to Carthage, and book 33 which is reduced to 55 lines giving an introduction to and the closing of the Macedonian War, with an interesting episode—the wonderful daring of M. Cato, son of the orator. The fulness of the details given in the episodes makes it probable that Justinus has transferred intact, or nearly so, a passage from Trogus to his own work. Outside of the episodes we can not tell what changes were made by Justinus in the narrative, though we may assume that his method was similar to that of Orosius in reducing the work of Justinus.

Augustine has the following statement in *de Civ. Dei* 4, 6 *init.* Iustinus, qui Graecam vel potius peregrinam Trogum Pompeium secutus non Latine tantum, sicut ille, verum etiam breviter scripsit historiam, opus librorum suorum sic incipit. Then he gives a quotation exactly reproducing the words of Justinus, and adding qualibet autem fide rerum vel iste vel Trogus scripserit. A statement similar to this is found in 5, 12 Catonis verba sive Sallustii, the latter word indicating the real

author. This utilization of Justinus shows that by the time of Augustine the Epitome had supplanted the original work, and the same is true for Orosius. He uses Justinus, but he has in 4, 6, 1 and 6 Pompeius Trogus et Justinus; and in 1, 8, 2-5 he has a quotation, introduced by the words Pompeius historicus eiusque brevior Iustinus docet, and followed by the words haec Justinus. The quotation in 1, 10, 2-5 is preceded by ait enim Pompeius sive Iustinus hoc modo, while he has in section 6 item Iustinus adserit. These passages show us that though Trogus is mentioned, the work of Orosius is not a parallel one to that of Justinus, but is a reduced reproduction of the work of Justinus, as the work of Justinus was of the work of Trogus.

There are few differences in the statement of facts, and some of these arise from improper condensation, as in J. 11, 5, 1 proficiscens ad Persicum bellum omnes novercae suae cognatos, quos Philippus in excelsiorem dignitatis locum provehens imperiis praefecerat, interfecit: O. 3, 16, 3 profecturus ad Persicum bellum omnes cognatos ac proximos suos interfecit. Two other statements will illustrate some of the ways in which Orosius has varied from Justinus: J. 8, 3, 6 inde veluti rebus egregie gestis in Cappadociam traicit, ubi bello pari perfidia gesto captisque per dolum et occisis finitimis regibus universam provinciam imperio Macedoniae adiungit: O. 3, 12, 18 post haec in Cappadociam transiit, ibique bellum pari perfidia gessit, captos per dolum finitimos reges interfecit totamque Cappadociam imperio Macedoniae subdidit. As in this, synonymous verbs are freely used by Orosius, and finite verbs take the place of ablatives absolute or *vice versa* according as statements are expanded or condensed. Of the great mass of changed statements only a few will be given, illustrating types of changes: Equivalent statements: J. 9, 4, 7 bona omnium occupavit: O. 3, 14, 1 omnes bonis privavit; different prepositional usage: J. 5, 9, 2 ad terrorem omnium interficiunt: O. 2, 17, 7 in exemplum timoremque reliquorum trucidant; *cum* instead of *et*: J. 6, 7, 3 quippe senes et cetera inbellis aetas: O. 3, 2, 6 armati enim senes cum reliqua turba inbellis aetatis; variation in statement of temporal relations: J. 6, 5, 1 quibus rebus cognitis: O. 3, 1, 21 cum comperissent; J. 6, 6, 1 dum haec geruntur . . . legatos mittit, per quos iubet omnes ab armis discedere: O. 3, 1, 25 interea . . . per legatos, ut ab armis discederent . . . imperavit. Variation

in adverbs, and especially in particles, as *velut: quasi, igitur: itaque, quoque: vero, ibi: ubi, interim: interea, non solum: non tantum* is noticeable, as well as with some other correlatives: J. 2, 9, 12 pugnatum est tanta virtute, ut hinc viros, inde pecudes putares: O. 2, 8, 10 tanta in eo bello diversitas certandi fuit, ut ex alia parte viri ad occidendum parati, ex alia pecudes ad moriendum praeparatae putarentur. Changes in the order of words meet us at every turn, as in J. 2, 14, 7 eodem forte die . . . etiam navali proelio in Asia sub monte Mycale adversus Persas dimicatum est: O. 2, 11, 4 nam forte eodem die . . . pars Persici exercitus in Asia sub monte Mycale navali proelio dimicabat.

2. The words of Justinus *per otium quo in urbe versabamur* show that his home was not at Rome. If not an Italian, was he an African? To determine the probability of this we shall compare his phraseology with that of some of the representatives of the African school—Florus, Apuleius, Tertullian and Arnobius. And in making the comparisons we must bear in mind the limitations of each. The work of Justinus professes to be a book of excerpts, and we need expect only such evidences of originality as are called for in welding together the selected portions of Trogus with a slightly changed syntax and vocabulary to suit the usage of the time of Justinus. It is not possible to determine definitely what is due to Justinus, and what is the residue from Trogus. Forty per cent. of the vocabulary of Justinus is not found in Caesar, and in this mass are about two hundred abstract nouns. As an illustration we take the word *successio*, mostly post-Augustan, with examples quoted from Tacitus, Suetonius, Justinus and Apuleius. Yet Schirmer¹ calls attention to the fact that the word occurs five times in the letters of Caelius. Justinus has in 11, 1, 8 *pro contione* which is not used by Caesar and Cicero, yet is found in a letter of Pollio, Cic. ad Fam. 10, 31, 5, and is the prevailing form in Tacitus and Suetonius. These are illustrations of the possibility that in the works of Brutus, of Caelius, of Calvus, of Pollio and of Trogus, may have been freely used many expressions which are catalogued as late, because by chance they are found in Justinus and in writers near his time.

¹ K. Schirmer, Ueber die Sprache des M. Brutus in den bei Cicero überlieferten Briefen. Progr. Metz, 1884.

However, as the father of Trogus had the care of the epistles of Caesar it is not too much to assume that the style of the son was a reflection of the style of Caesar, and that stylistic variations from Caesar, in harmony with a later usage, are due to Justinus. As an illustration of this we may take the final infinitive. Occasionally used by poets, it is avoided by the Plinies, Quintilian, Suetonius and Tacitus, but is found in Apuleius, Gellius and Justinus. We may well distrust the correctness of the text of earlier examples which are cited, and believe that Justinus was one of the first of the prose writers using the construction. Justinus has in 18, 1, 1 *et ipsis auxilio adversus Romanos indigentibus*, a post-Augustan construction of *indigens* with the ablative, instances of which are to be found in the works of Seneca, as in B. 4, 3, 2 *reges aliena ope non indigentes*.

At the head of the recognized African writers is Florus, if you will, historian, poet, rhetorician; see Wölfflin, *Archiv* 6, 1 foll. He does not make excerpts as does Justinus, but he takes some of the material of Livy, and weaves it into a new fabric. A few passages will illustrate this: F. 1, 1, 6 *gemini erant*: L. 1, 6, 4 *quoniam gemini essent*; F. 1, 1, 16 *cum contionem haberet ante urbem apud Caprae paludem, e conspectu ablatum est*: L. 1, 16, 1 *cum contionem in campo ad Caprae paludem haberet, subito coorta tempestas . . . tam denso regem operuit nimbo, ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit*; F. 1, 7, 2 *regnum . . . rapere maluit quam expectare*: L. 1, 47, 2 *defuisse . . . qui habere quam sperare regnum mallet*; F. 1, 13, 5 *ab ultimis terrarum oris et cingente omnia Oceano*: L. 5, 37, 2 *ab Oceano terrarumque ultimis oris bellum ciente*; F. 2, 6, 7 *'in hoc ego sinu bellum pacemque porto; utrum eligitis?' succlamantibus bellum, 'bellum igitur' inquit 'accipite'. Et excusso in media curia togae gremio non sine horrore, quasi plane sinu bellum ferret, effudit*: L. 21, 18, 13 *tum Romanus sinu ex toga facto 'Hic' inquit 'vobis bellum et pacem portamus: utrum placet, sumite'*. Sub hanc vocem haud minus ferociter, daret utrum vellet, succlamatum est. Et cum is iterum sinu effuso bellum dare dixisset, accipere se omnes responderunt.

Apuleius, fabulist, philosopher, pleader, gives the completest example of secular African Latinity. But there are some

noticeable differences between his *Metamorphoses* and the remainder of his works. As a temporal particle, *ut* occurs only in the former, and also nearly all the instances of *ubi*. *Donec* is also limited to the same work, and *quoad* also with the exception of Flor. 2, 14, 47 *quoad* vixit; and de Magia 58, 523 *quoad* habitavit. *Quippe* occurs about one-third as frequently in the *Metamorphoses* as in his other works, in the first most freely with *cum*, in the latter with *qui*.

Tertullian '*acris et vehementis ingenii*', and Arnobius, *expugnator et propugnator fidei*, are both prolific in expression, and for this reason their vocabulary has but very little in common with that of Justinus. There is however one rhetorical feature common to them all.

Play on words, whether as rhyme (see Wölfflin, Archiv 1, 350 foll., Der Reim im Lateinischen) or as alliteration (see Wölfflin, Archiv 3, 443 foll., Zur Allitteration und zum Reime), is a noticeable feature of the African school, and Apuleius and Tertullian are among the best representatives; see H. Hoppe, Syntax und Stil des Tertullian, pp. 162-172; sec. 5 Der Reim; sec. 6 Das Wortspiel. Some good illustrations are found in Justinus: 4, 1, 10 nunc hic fremitum . . . nunc illic gemitum, on which Wölfflin remarks "ganz afrikanisch". 6, 1, 5 differant bella, quam gerant; 24, 5, 10 nomina sicuti numina; 31, 7, 9 belli ea inritamenta, non pacis blandimenta. The words are sometimes akin: 11, 5, 10 iaculum . . . iecit; 18, 4, 12 involucris involuta; 43, 4, 10 insidianti regi insidiae praetenduntur; 13, 8, 6 insidiae in insidiatores versae, et qui securum adgressuros se putabant, securis . . . occursum est. As in the last example, contrasts of the different cases are found: 12, 12, 9 Antipatri . . . Antipatrum; 12, 15, 10 viro forti . . . virum fortem; 18, 2, 2 externo . . . externis. We find the same usage with verbs also: 5, 6, 8 cum paulo ante salutem desperaverint, nunc non desperent victoriam; 5, 8, 8 mutato statu . . . condicio mutatur; 11, 14, 4 patere . . . patuerit; 12, 6, 5 modo personam occisi, modo causam occidendi considerans.

In discussing the functions of an orator, Fronto has on page 139 N. castella verborum, conciliabula verborum loco, gradus, pondera, aetates dignitatesque dinoscere . . . quae ratio sit verba geminandi et interdum trigeminandi, nonnumquam quadriplicia, saepe quinquies aut eo amplius superlata ponendi. In

Fronto's own letters three terms are most freely used. In this respect the usage has the widest sweep in Apuleius and Arnobius, the number of terms given ranging from three to a dozen. Occurrences are not uncommon in Justinus, e. g. 5, 6, 9 *neque* is miles . . . *neque* eae vires . . . *neque* ea scientia; 5, 7, 5 *non* pueros imprudentia, *non* senes debilitas, *non* mulieres sexus imbecillitas domi tenet. So far as these features are concerned the color of the narrative in Justinus is like that of the African writers. An archaistic color also is not lacking, and among the terms discussed by Wölfflin (Archiv 7, 467 foll., Minucius Felix) as archaistic touches, Justinus has *prosapia*, *perpes*, *indolesco*, and *in totum*; see Archiv 4, 146.

Other evidences of the African character of the Latinity of Justinus is found in the African Inscriptions. B. Kübler (Archiv 8, 161 foll., Die lateinische Sprache auf afrikan. Inschriften) in the list of words given shows that in some respects the vocabulary of the inscriptions is similar to that of Justinus. This is most noticeable in the use of abstracts in *-tas*, *aeternitas*, *exiguitas*, *frugalitas*, *levitas*, *posteritas*, and *pubertas*. Of adjectives in *-alis* are given *extemporalis*, *venalis* and (*matronalis*). Here as in Justinus are found *supra modum*, *circa* = *erga*, *unicum*, *nec non et*, *pariter ac* and *et*. Considering that Fronto does not use *ad instar* which is found in Justinus 36, 3, 2, Wölfflin, Archiv 2, 590, holds that Justinus is later than Fronto. Apuleius uses the phrase most freely, and occurrences are not lacking in other African writers. *Adunatis iv regibus* is in the ablative, as in most of the passages of Justinus in which this favorite verb is found. Instead of *pluvia*, Justinus has *imber* which is found eleven times in the inscriptions. *Grandis* and *modicus*, and perhaps *natalis* for *natalis dies* occur in both. Here are also found expressions similar to some used by Florus and Apuleius, e. g. *amator studiorum*: Florus 1, 1, 5 *ipse fluminis amator et montium*; *columen morum*: Apul. Flor. 3, 16, 73 *ad honoris mei tribunal et columen*. If these expressions illustrate the African coloring of the narrative of Florus and Apuleius, they may be held to do the same for that of Justinus.

There are a few other rhetorical features in which the coloring does not differ from that of the African writers. All agree in the limited use of *etsi* and *quamvis*, Justinus having the latter but once. *Licet*, not in Florus nor Suetonius, occurs twice in

Justinus, and more freely in Apuleius. They also agree in the limited use of *tamquam*, but differ widely with *velut* and *quasi*. In the use of the formula *non modo . . . sed etiam* and its equivalents, Justinus, Apuleius, Tertullian and Arnobius are alike in the tendency to use *verum* instead of *sed*, but the usage with *modo*, *solum* and *tantum* varies.

The list of individual constructions and expressions found in Justinus and the African writers is a long one, but only the most important need be mentioned. A *quod*-clause, instead of the accusative and infinitive, is noticeable in Justinus, and flourishes in Apuleius, and the same is true of words in *-bundus*. *Temporis* with *tum* or *tunc* is found in Just. I, 4, 4; 3, 6, 6; 31, 2, 6; Apul. Met. 3, 4, 180; 10, 13, 700; 11, 24, 804; and Tert. de Baptismo 14 tunc temporis ad Corinthios scripta sunt. The correlatives *primum . . . mox* and *hinc . . . inde* are not unusual. Some of the words are well suited for Christian usage. Cicero uses *fragilitas* and *infirmitas*, but Seneca seems to have given them universal application, as in Ep. 15, 12 oblitus fragilitatis humanae. Compare with this Just. 23, 3, 12 in ostentationem fragilitatis humanae; and Apul. Met. 9, 18, 627 which resemble Arnobius 6, 2 infirmitatis humanae; cf. Min. Felix 12, 3 nondum agnoscis fragilitatem. *Pagani*, *parvuli*, *praesumptio*, and *reatus* may be placed in the same class. We find in Arnobius 1, 40 patibulo adfixus; and in 1, 62 patibulo pendere. In Justinus *patibulum* occurs twice with *suffigere*, 22, 7, 8; and 30, 2, 7; and also in Apul. Met. 6, 31, 443; and 10, 12, 700; cf. 4, 10, 259; and 6, 32, 445. The use of the word for *crux* judging by the occurrences in these three writers would seem to be African. With their statements we may compare Suet. Jul. Caes. 74 suffixurum cruci; Dom. 11 c. figeret. *Compesco*, *delitesco*, *indubitatus*, *inexpiabilis*, *parricidalis* and *poenalis* are also common to Justinus and the Christian writers.

There are a number of terms, chiefly secular, which tell the same story as those already mentioned. Tides external and internal are indicated by *aestus*; Just. 23, 3, 8 periculorum; Florus 2, 7, 1 quodam quasi aestu et torrente fortunae; 4, 2, 64 quidam fugae a.; Just. 11, 13, 3 magno se aestu liberatum; Apul. Met. 3, 1, 172 aestus invadit animum. Both Justinus and Apuleius (Met. 10, 3, 684; and de Magia 64, 536) have

causa et origo; cf. Arnobius 2, 52 c. atque o. nascendi. *Com-militium*, *divisio*, *ducatu*, *medela*, *pernicitas* (see Archiv 8, 452), *proelior*, *proventus*, *respectu*, and *tirocinia* are among the nouns showing the African connections of Justinus. *Interiecto tempore* and similar expressions are characteristic of Justinus, and are found in Apul. Met. 7, 20, 485 nec multis i. diebus; 10, 27, 729 paucis; 7, 23, 491 spatio modico i.; as also in Sen. B. 3, 1, 2. *Iterato* is freely used by Justinus and is found in Apul. Met. 9, 25, 641, as also in Tert. adv. Iud. 13. *Nihil tale metuentes* occurs in Justinus 25, 2, 6; and Florus 2, 12, 5; cf. Sen. D. 12, 15, 2. Compare Justinus 19, 3, 12 obseratis foribus with Apul. Met. 9, 2, 596; 10, 19, 713 fore; 8, 14, 546 valvis. We find in Just. 31, 5, 3 veniam deinde libertati praefatus; Apul. Met. 1, 1, 9 en ecce praefamur v.; 11, 23, 802 praefatus deum v.; Flor. 1, 1, 3 praefanda v.; de Mag. 75, 551 honos auribus p. The arrangement *versa vice* which begins with Seneca, occurs also in Justinus and Apuleius; see Archiv 4, 67.

There are a few points in the use of pronouns which are worthy of notice. Sallust has in Iug. 9, 4 huiusmodi, and to this may be due Just. 29, 2, 7 h. oratione. It is also used by Apul. in Met. 2, 12, 117; 9, 18, 628; de Mag. 13, 415 versibus. Paul Thielman, Archiv 7, 362 Der Ersatz des Reciproculs im Lateinischen, *Invicem*, *Mutuo*, *Vicissim*, presents the case for these words with the reflexive, showing that "Völlig durchgedrungen ist inv. + Refl. zur Zeit der Antonine". The use of *mutuus* is the same, though Justinus does not have *vicissim* with the reflexive. Combinations of *velut* and *quasi* with *quidam* are of frequent occurrence in Justinus, Florus and Apuleius, though as freely used by some other writers. Of adjectives not freely used may be given *inexplebilis*, *infantilis*, and *insatiabilis*. *Perpes* and *pervigil* have the same associations, as also *venerabilis*: Just. 42, 3, 5 v. nomen (Alexandri); Apul. Met. 3, 29, 231 v. principis n. *Aliquantisper*, *qualitercumque* and *vix . . . aegre* are limited to a few writers, and for that reason are not least in importance in a discussion of the relations of Justinus. However, he has the last words separated in 9, 7, 6 vix . . . mitigatus est . . . aegre compulsus, while other writers have them connected, usually by *et*; see Archiv 7, 467. Justinus and Apuleius have *ferme*, while *simul* with a connective has not infrequently lost its temporal force. Notice Just. 6, 3, 6 gloriam

diversis artibus quam priores duces consecuturus; and Florus 2, 2, 24 diversa quam hostis mandaverat censuit.

There are a few points of interest in the prepositional usage. The use of *ad instar* seems to link Justinus with the age of Apuleius, and *ad postremum*, which is characteristic of Justinus, occurs also a few times in Apuleius. *Apud* in local connections, though used in this way a few times by Justinus, is not as fully developed as in Florus, who has it in some passages where Livy uses *ad*. The original local association of *pone* is retained in Just. 7, 2, 8. Apuleius is freest in the use of the word, and has it six times with *terga*, while Justinus has in 1, 6, 11 post terga. Justinus has *usque* with both *ad* and *in*, and without either, and in both temporal and local relations, e. g. 33, 2, 6 Persen; 1, 1, 6 Aegyptum; 42, 2, 8 a Cappadocia usque mare Caspium. On the basis of this usage Wölfflin, Archiv 4, 55, maintains that Justinus must be placed after Tacitus and Suetonius, and adds "Da nun die christliche Litteratur, wie wir gleich zeigen werden, die Zurückhaltung des Tacitus und Sueton nicht teilt, so wird man geneigt sein den Justin in der Christengemeinde zu suchen". Here may belong Just. 5, 8, 5 Piraeum versus; Apul. Met. 9, 21, 632 forum v.; 10, 13, 700; and 11, 26, 809 Romam v.

The particles in Justinus present some interesting features. Noticeable among them is *atque ita*, which occurs nearly three score times, as in 2, 4, 25 Hercules . . . pretium . . . accepit. *Atque ita* functus imperio ad regem revertitur; 12, 12, 4 ait . . . crediturum. *Atque ita* iuvenes . . . legit; 43, 4, 9 ille rem . . . defert; *atque ita* . . . comprehenduntur. There are occasional instances in Florus, e. g. 2, 12, 3 Thracas in res suas traxerant, *atque ita* industriam . . . temperavere; 4, 10, 5 sic quoque hostem fortasse non defore. *Atque ita* secuta est minor vis hostium. In Arnobius there are at least seven occurrences, and here and there one in Tertullian. *Forsitan*, with adjective or noun, is found in Just. 4, 5, 3 graviora et forsitan feliciora bella; 24, 7, 3 et animos hostibus, forsitan et auxilia accessura; and in Apul. Met. 7, 21, 488 lites atque iurgia immo forsitan et crimina pariet. *Igitur*, resuming the narrative after a suspension, is found in Justinus and Florus, as in Just. 11, 7, 14 post hunc filius Mida regnavit . . . Igitur Alexander . . . requisivit. Mithridates is mentioned in 42, 3, 2, and then chapter 4, 1 continues, *igitur* M.; Florus 1, 1, 4 cuius ex filia Romulus.

Igitur prima iuventutis face patrum deturbat; 1, 4, 1 Ancus deinde Marcius . . . igitur et muro moenia amplexus est; 2, 6, 2 puer Hannibal . . . iuraverat, nec morabatur. Igitur in causam belli Saguntos electa est. In Just. 15, 1, 8 additis insuper muneribus; and 24, 4, 9 addita insuper contumelia, *insuper* is placed within the parts of an ablative absolute, as in Florus 1, 18, 6 addito i. ferarum terrore; cf. 1, 13, 17; 2, 2, 17; Apul. Met. 7, 18, 481; see Archiv 5, 355. *Desuper* in Just. 21, 6, 6 vacua d. cera inducta, is similar to Florus 2, 6, 6 rogam, tum d. se suosque . . . corrumpunt; 3, 2, 6 turres, et d. . . . tropaea fixerunt. *Pariter* like *simul* is used by Justinus and Apuleius merely to strengthen the connective, as in Just. 1, 10, 20; 25, 1, 8 opes p. et negligentiam; 9, 8, 8 blandus p. et insidiosus; 28, 4, 7 suo p. et hostium cruore; 12, 11, 2 exactio p. ac solutio; 38, 8, 11 sorori p. ac patriae; Apul. Met. 2, 15, 124 mari p. ac terrae; Just. 8, 1, 3 victos p. victoresque. *Prorsus* is one of the favorites of Justinus, and is used in three connections; a. with adjectives; b. with *ut*; and c. with *quasi*. a. In Justinus *prorsus* follows the adjective, as in 8, 2, 11; and 12, 3, 11 immemor p. Apuleius also uses the word freely, as in Met. 1, 23, 71 deque hac virginali p. verecundia. b. *Prorsus ut* with a consecutive clause comes next in frequency, in four out of the seven occurrences with some form of *videre*, as also in the three instances in Florus. *Incertum sit* is used in Just. 2, 1, 4; and 24, 6, 7; see Archiv 4, 619. In Apuleius the statement is comparative in Met. 9, 14, 620 prorsus ut in . . . latrinam. c. *Prorsus* occurs with *quasi* half a dozen times in Justinus, and occasionally in Apuleius: Met. 8, 27, 582; 9, 9, 611 p. q. possent tanti facinoris evadere supplicium. In common with Suetonius, both Justinus and Apuleius use *sed et*; see Draeger 2, 110.

3. The educational aim of Justinus was realized, for, as we have seen, his abbreviation supplanted the original work of Trogus. The suggestion for the work may have come from that of Florus. If so he intended to put the work of Trogus on a level with that of Livy, so far as it could be done by means of an Epitome. If this assumption is a valid one, it is an added indication that Justinus was an African, and that he had been subject to the influence of Florus, not necessarily as a pupil, but at least through his school training. While we may assume a connection between Justinus and Florus, we may also assume

that there was none between Florus and Fronto. The basis for this is the account of the rings carried to Carthage after the battle of Cannae. We find in Livy 23, 12, 1 *effundi in vestibulo curiae iussit anulos aureos, qui tantus acervus fuit, ut metientibus supra tris modios explesse sint quidam auctores*; fama tenuit, quae propior vero est, haud plus fuisse modio. The *equites* are mentioned later in the account. The least amount is accepted in Per. 23 *anulos aureos corporibus occisorum detractos, in vestibulo curiae effudit, quos excessisse modii mensuram traditur*. Florus gives a slightly different account 2, 6, 18 *modii duo anulorum Carthaginem missi dignitasque equestris taxata mensura*. The statement of the *quidam auctores* is accepted by Val. Max. 7, 2, Ext. 16 Magone . . . *anulos aureos trium modiorum mensuram explentes fundente, qui interceptis nostris civibus detracti erant*; and the latter is repeated by Fronto, p. 220 N., *anulorum aureorum, quos caesis equitibus Romanis Poeni detraxerant, tres modios cumulatos misit Carthaginem*. It is equally clear that neither Fronto nor Gellius were familiar with Justinus nor with Seneca. Gellius in 19, 8 tells how Fronto corrected a friend of his, a *bene eruditus homo et tum poeta inlustris*, who had been healed *quod 'harenis calentibus' esset usus*. The chapter ends with the words *harenas . . . praeter C. Caesarem, quod equidem meminerim, nemo id doctorum hominum dedit*. Yet Seneca uses it, as in D. 6, 18, 6; Ep. 55, 2; and 115, 8, and *moles harenarum* is found in Just. 1, 9, 3; 4, 1, 6; 15, 3, 11. This apparent disregard of the diction of Seneca suggests a new line of approach for the study of Justinus.

Seneca was subject to the cutting sarcasm of Caligula (Suet. Cal. 53), was criticised by Quintilian (10, 1, 125-131), and carped at by Fronto (p. 155-6 N.) and Gellius (12, 2). Tacitus indicates only the position of Seneca, in Ann. 12, 8, 9 *ob claritudinem studiorum eius*, while Suet. Nero 52 does not highly commend him: a *philosophia eum mater avertit . . . a cognitione veterum oratorum Seneca praeceptor, quo diutius in admiratione sui detineret*. With the tide of criticism setting in so strong against him it is not strange that he seems to have dropped out of sight at Rome, and that Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius who were philosophically akin to him do not mention his name at all. But in Africa it was far different. By the

time of Tertullian, born about 160 A. D., the place of Seneca among the Christians was secure, for Tertullian says of him in *de Anima* 20, introducing a quotation from *Sen. de Benef.*, *Seneca saepe noster*. In *Apol.* 50 he also mentions *In Fortuitis*, and in *sec. 42*, and in *de Res. Carnis* 1 he refers to the *Troades*. Augustine, *de Civ. Dei* 6, 10 and 11, almost claims Seneca as an ally *adfuit enim scribenti, viventi defuit*. In the *Confessiones* 5, 6, 11 he places Tullius and Seneca in the same category. In passing we might say that his mention of Madaura (2, 3, 5) suggests the possibility that Seneca was taught in the school at that place, and so was well known to Apuleius. Midway between Tertullian and Augustine a free use of Seneca was made by Lactantius. The above indicates the close connection of the works of Seneca with African instruction, and suggests that he, rejected by the Roman rhetoricians, had become the corner of the instruction in Africa.

The extent and the strength of the opposition to Seneca at Rome evidences his influence in bringing into the current of Latin expression modifications of the phraseology of Cicero. This will be the more clear if we consider that the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* is a protest against the spirit of the work of Seneca. But between the age of Seneca and that of the Antonines came the Plinies, Quintilian, Suetonius and Tacitus, and if an element is found in any two of these it can not be told from which of the two it came to African Latinity, even if it came from either. Yet considering that Seneca was recognized as an educational force by the African Christians, the appearance of elements common to him and to the Africans at least shows the possibility of the influence of Seneca, through the use of his works in schools such as that at Madaura. As illustrations of this possibility we shall give a few words. *Dignus* with the infinitive is not in Vell. Paterc., Suetonius and Tacitus; but occurs in Seneca, Quintilian, Gellius and Apuleius, while the same construction with *dedignari* is found in Seneca, the *Annals* of Tacitus, and Justinus. The inf. with *impero*, starting with Seneca, is found in Justinus as is *praecipere* also, and both the verbs are freely so used by Suetonius. It is not too much to assume that in the case of these words it was the usage of Seneca which influenced the African writers. But in the use of *vix et aegre* there is no intermediary for they occur in *Sen. Ep.* 118, 17;

Florus 2, 10, 3; Apul. Met. 1, 19, 63; and in 1, 14, 52 vix tandem et aegerrime; Arnobius 3, 11 aegre atque aegerrime; and in Just. 9, 7, 6 vix . . . aegre. Draeger 1, 327, 7, under the imperatives of deponents with middle meaning, quotes only Sen. N. Q. 4 Praef. 5 formare "*bilde dich*"; Apul. Met. 1, 19, 62 explere latice fontis lacteo "*trinke dich satt*"; and 11, 29, 816 rursum sacris initiare "*lass dich weihen*". Also at 1, 334 are quoted from Seneca and Apuleius examples of direct questions where the indirect might be expected. Seneca has in Ep. 12, 1 inter manus, which is also found in several passages in Apuleius. *Alternis* is used ten times by Seneca, as in Ep. 120, 19 *al. . . al.*; and by Just. in 2, 4, 12 *vicibus . . . al.*, while Apuleius has *alterna* in Met. 10, 17, 710. Sen., Ep. 1, 2; and D. 10, 9, 1, has pendet ex crastino, and Apuleius, *crastino* in Met. in 2, 11, 116; 6, 31, 444. Florus has in 2, 17, 11 *opima* without *spolia*, as also Sen. in Herc. Fur. 48. There are a few points in the prepositional usage in which Seneca agrees as well as disagrees with the African writers. *Ex* causal is found in Sen. Ep. 12, 9; Just. 3, 2, 4; and Apul. Met. 1, 2, 11. Florus has in 2, 3, 4 *ex occasione* the same as Seneca and Suetonius. Livy has the phrase, but we should expect in Florus the more common form *per o*. The usage with *obtentu* and *titulo* is not the same, as Seneca has *sub titulo*, and Justinus *sub obtentu*. The following are given as points of agreement: Sen. D. 9, 2, 5 ex quo agnosceret quisque partem suam; Just. 33, 2, 8 in patriam suam quisque remissus est; cf. Florus 1, 13, 10; 4, 2, 12; B. 7, 19, 8 in ore parentum liberos iugulat: Just. 31, 2, 3 in oculis observari. They also agree in the use of *inexplebilis*, *contremisco* with the accusative, and of *compesco* which is freely used by Seneca instead of *comprimo*. *Calco* used in a metaphorical sense is characteristic of Seneca, while *desaevio*, chiefly poetical, occurs in Sen. Ep. 15, 8; and D. 5, 1, 1 dum tempestas prima desaevit. The latter finds a parallel in Florus 2, 6, 12 secunda Punici belli procella desaevit. *Nec non et* for which Kübler (Archiv 8, 181) and Lease (Archiv 10, 390) furnish lists, is not unknown to Seneca: B. 5, 20, 5 quod ipse praestare voluisset nec non et debuisset.

The greater freedom of Apuleius and his extension of the use of the *quod*-clause instead of the subject acc. with the infinitive, lead us to place Justinus before the time of Apuleius.

At the same time there are two passages which Apuleius might easily have selected from Justinus for his own use in his own way. The first of these is Met. 10, 31, 741 *si sibi praemium . . . addixisset, et sese regnum totius Asiae tributuram*, the promise of Venus to the Trojan Alexander, while Just. 11, 7, 4 *nexum si quis solvisset, eum tota Asia regnaturum*, found its fulfilment in the Grecian Alexander. Apuleius writes in Met. 1, 2, 11 *postquam ardua montium et lubrica vallium et roscida cespitum et glebosa camporum emensi*. Justinus has in 41, 1, 11 *ut non immensa tantum ac profunda camporum, verum etiam praerupta collium montiumque ardua occupaverint*. The position and arrangement of *ardua montium*, the change in connectives, the lack of differentiation in *immensa . . . profunda*, and in *cespitum . . . camporum*, make one passage seem the rhetorical development of the other. Seneca has *blandimentum* and *inritamentum* several times, as in Ep. 51, 5 i. *vitiorum . . . b. voluptatum*, but in D. 5, 9, 2 *lituos et tubas concitamenta esse, sicut quosdam cantus blandimenta*. Justinus has in 31, 7, 9 *belli ea inritamenta, non pacis blandimenta esse*; and Apul. de Magia 98, 593 *blandimentis . . . illectamentis*. The words *concitamenta* and *illectamenta* are unusual, but the reversal of the order of the terms by Apuleius at least suggests the words of Justinus as the basis of his own. If these assumptions are valid, then the position assigned to Justinus after Fronto on the basis of the usage with *ad instar* is not tenable; see Archiv 2, 590 "Auch beweist die Stelle von *ad instar* bei Justin 36, 3, 2 . . . dass der Epitomator nach Fronto gesetzt werden muss."

If the development of Latin were along one line only the usage with *usque* and *ad instar* would seem to place Justinus after Fronto. But Seneca has *instar* in Thyest. 873 *fluminis*; D. 12, 1, 4 *consolationis*; and in Ep. 61, 1 *vitae*. See also in Ep. 53, 1 a *Parthenope tua usque Puteolos*. The usage with both terms in Seneca is as near to that of Justinus as is the usage of Fronto, and if Justinus had studied Seneca, the step from *usque ad* to *usque*, and from *instar* to *ad instar* would be as easy for a student follower of Seneca, as it would be for a historical follower of Fronto. The testimony of Servius, ad Aen. 6, 685 *ad instar enim non dicimus*, indicates that to him the African usage was unknown; and we maintain that the witnesses brought forward do not prove that Justinus wrote later than Fronto.

In his vocabulary Fronto has little of note that is used by Justinus. *Pernicitas, huiuscemodi, invicem se* and *tametsi . . . tamen* are the most noticeable. And the limited number of these make more important some passages in the letters written in 144 A. D., ad M. Caesarem, IV, p. 58 foll. N.

It is interesting to note that although *advena* occurs in Just. 2, 1, 6; 2, 5, 3; and 2, 6, 4 quippe non advena neque passim populi conluviis originem urbi dedit, *convena* occurs only in 38, 7, 1 clariorem illa conluvie convenarum, as in Fronto, p. 58 N., diversis nationibus convenae variis moribus inbuti. The phraseology in Fronto, p. 63 N., caput atque fons Romanae facundiae, is varied in Just. 13, 6, 11 ad ipsum fontem et caput regni; Arnobius 2, 2; and Lactantius 5, 14, 11; and there is a further variation in Gellius 10, 20, 7 caput ipsum et origo et quasi fons; cf. Florus 3, 6, 12 in o. fontemque belli. It should be noticed that Justinus has *causa et origo* in earlier passages 1, 7, 2; 3, 4, 2; 8, 1, 4; and 11, 7, 5, and that the same combination is used by Apuleius and Arnobius; see p. 32. We find in Fronto, p. 59 N., ut amicos ac sectatores suos amore inter se mutuo copularet. Compare with this Just. 26, 1, 3 aut . . . societatem iungebant aut mutuis inter se odiis in bellum ruebant. This is the sole instance of *m. inter se* in Just., and though he does not have *copulo*, he has *iungo* in one part of his statement, and, in the other, reverses the order of the noun and adjective as used by Fronto. In Florus 4, 2, 33; Apul. de Mundo 5, 297; and Dogm. Plat. 1, 11, 203 *inter se* is not inclosed between adjective and noun. Just. has in 41, 4, 4 dum invicem eripere sibi regnum volunt; and Fronto, p. 59 N., invideant i. amici tui sibi. The separation of *invicem* and *sibi* is the same in both, and in addition, these are the only passages in the two writers in which *invicem* is used with *sibi*. The use of *convena* instead of the earlier *advena*; of *fons et caput* instead of the earlier *causa et origo*, and varying from Fronto's *c. atque f.*; of *mutuis inter se odiis*, a variation of *amore inter se mutuo*; and of *invicem . . . sibi* indicates a complimentary use of two letters of the ex-consul, about a year after his consulship. If the above conclusions are valid the date for Justinus is 144 or 145 A. D.

Let us summarize the conclusions to which we have come. The absence of any mention of Sertorius who was so closely connected with the history of the family indicates that Trogus

considered the account of Livy entirely adequate, and that he wrote after Books 90-96 of Livy dealing with the Sertorian war were published. The date of publication is more definitely shown by the adaptation of a line from the first book of Phaedrus. Stylistic resemblances show that Justinus was an African, and his own statements fix his date between the reign of Hadrian and 226 A. D. But it is probable that he was influenced by the writings of Seneca, and for this reason his use of *ad instar* and *usque* do not have any weight in fixing his date after Fronto. On the other hand the more restricted usage of Justinus at certain points renders it probable that he came before Apuleius, and this view is strengthened by the apparent rhetorical development by Apuleius of two statements in Justinus. There is no indication of any connection between Florus and Fronto, although from the work of the former may have come the suggestion for the work of Justinus. But there are four pieces of phraseology in Justinus apparently directly based on the words of Fronto found in two letters written in 144 A. D. And these seem to fix definitely the date of the sojourn of Justinus at Rome and the preparation of his work in 144 or 145 A. D.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.